



MO  
ED  
2:Sh 8/4

# **1997 SHOW-ME PROGRESS**

## **Second-Year Report January 1998**

MISSOURI STATE LIBRARY

SEP 15 1998 6 04

DEPOSITORY DOCUMENT

### **Mapping a Brighter Future**

Funding for the planning and printing of the 1997 Show-Me Progress, Second-Year Report was provided through the Goals 2000:  
Educate America Act.

# **1997 SHOW-ME PROGRESS**

## **Second-Year Report**

**January 1998**

### **Mapping a Brighter Future**

Published by the Missouri State Board of Education

---

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Introduction.....	1	Health and Human Services.....	20
Missouri's Goals 2000 Budget Summary.....	2	Subsequent Year Grants	
Missouri's Goals 2000 Grant Summary .....	3	Preservice/Professional Development....	21
State Activities.....	4	Curriculum and Assessment.....	22
State Progress.....	8	Community Outreach and Participation..	24
The Show-Me Plan Benchmarks.....	8	Health and Human Services.....	24
Missouri Educational Technology Benchmarks...	15	Multiple Areas.....	25
Local Activities.....	17	Preservice Education Grants .....	27
First Year Grants		Preservice Education Grants.....	29
Governance.....	18	LEA Improvement.....	40
Preservice/Professional Development....	18	MMAT Score Distribution .....	41
Curriculum and Assessment.....	19		

# **1997 Show-Me Progress Second-Year Report**

## **Introduction**

In 1994 Congress enacted the Goals 2000: Educate America Act to improve teaching and learning. Title III of the Act, entitled "State and Local Education Systemic Improvement," authorized funds to promote school improvement in the states and school districts. The improvement efforts are focused on long-term planning and the development and implementation of curriculum content and student performance standards. At the state level, the success of these efforts is demonstrated in the Show-Me Plan, the Show-Me Technology Plan, and the Show-Me Standards.

Many Missouri school districts received funds to develop curriculum aligned with the Show-Me Standards, to develop their own plans for improvement, and to implement those planned activities. As time progresses, we are finding new ways to integrate and consolidate the planning and implementation required of other federal programs into this process and to create better connections with the Missouri School Improvement Program.

This 1997 Show-Me Progress report provides a summary of the second year of the grant program. The summary includes:

- The Goals 2000 budget
- State-level activities
- Measurements of state progress
- Local-level activities for first and subsequent year grants in the areas of:
  - Governance
  - Preservice/Professional Development
  - Curriculum and Assessment
  - Community Outreach and Participation
  - Health and Human Resources
- Preservice Education Grants

We are encouraged by the progress thus far, but are confident of even better things to come as the state and schools work in partnership for the improvement of student achievement.

## Missouri's Goals 2000 Budget Summary

	First Year (FY95)	Second Year (FY96)	Second Year Additional Allotment (FY96)	Third Year (FY97)	Third Year Additional Allotment (FY97)
<b>State Reserve</b>	<b>\$668,936</b>	<b>\$652,594</b>	<b>\$123,645</b>	<b>\$613,207</b>	<b>\$1,360</b>
Program	568,936	552,594	123,645	513,207	1,360
Administration	100,000	100,000		100,000	
<b>Subgrants</b>	<b>947,333</b>	<b>5,873,341</b>		<b>5,518,866</b>	
Local Reform	800,000	3,873,341		3,518,866	
Preservice Education	147,333	2,000,000		2,000,000	
<b>Technology Planning</b>	<b>75,000</b>				
<b>Year Total</b>	<b>\$1,691,269</b>	<b>\$6,525,935</b>	<b>\$123,645</b>	<b>\$6,132,073</b>	<b>\$1,360</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>					<b>\$14,474,282</b>

## Missouri's Goals 2000 Grant Summary

	1996 Grant Cycle		1997 Grant Cycle	
	Number of Grants	Total Amount Approved	Number of Grants	Total Amount Approved
<b>Local Reform</b>				
<b>First Year</b>				
Governance	2	42,000	3	67,926
Preservice / Professional Development	23	331,001	7	134,492
Curriculum and Assessment	98	1,250,435	26	733,251
Community Outreach and Participation	12	119,830	0	0
Health and Human Services	10	117,915	6	83,859
<b>First Year Subtotal</b>	<b>145*</b>	<b>\$1,861,181</b>	<b>42**</b>	<b>\$1,019,528</b>
<b>Subsequent Year</b>				
Governance	-NA-	-NA-	0	0
Preservice / Professional Development	-NA-	-NA-	5	202,035
Curriculum and Assessment	-NA-	-NA-	37	1,498,788
Community Outreach and Participation	-NA-	-NA-	6	234,251
Health and Human Services	-NA-	-NA-	6	214,983
Multiple Areas	-NA-	-NA-	7	231,129
<b>Subsequent Year Subtotal</b>	<b>-NA-</b>	<b>-NA-</b>	<b>61***</b>	<b>2,381,186</b>
<b>Local Reform Subtotal</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>\$1,861,181</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>\$3,400,714</b>
<b>Preservice Education</b>			<b>9</b>	<b>232,199</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>\$1,861,181</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>\$3,632,913</b>

### NOTE

\* 1996 Grant Cycle First Year grants served 183 school districts either singularly or in consortium.

\*\* 1997 Grant Cycle First Year grants served 69 school districts either singularly or in consortium.

\*\*\* 1997 Grant Cycle Subsequent Year grants served 72 school districts either singularly or in consortium.

259 school districts have been served either singularly or in consortium during the first two grant cycles of Local Reform and Preservice Education grants.

## State Activities

In August of 1994, Missouri received a first year grant to begin planning activities related to the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. The grant provided funds to convene a "Goals 2000 State Panel" and a "Technology Task Force" to develop a State Improvement Plan and State Technology Plan. Governor Carnahan and the State Board of Education selected more than 100 Missouri citizens to serve on the two panels.

Since their first meeting in January of 1995, these two groups have:

1. Approved the steps in the planning process.
2. Approved the grassroots outreach activities.
3. Consulted with major statewide constituency groups.
4. Reviewed current school reform initiatives.
5. Identified overlaps and gaps in these initiatives.
6. Gathered information and resources to coordinate existing initiatives.
7. Identified new strategies to develop a cohesive plan.

The State Improvement Plan and the State Technology Plan requirements in the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, as well as the format of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), were used as the basis in developing the subcommittee structure. State Panel members were assigned to the following committees:

- Curriculum and Assessment
- Governance and Administration
- Health and Human Services

- Parent and Community Involvement
- Professional Development

The Technology Task Force members were assigned to the following committees:

- Access and Availability
- Business and Industry Partnerships
- Learning Technologies
- Technology Training and Technical Assistance

A facilitator and a recorder were assigned to each of the committees to assist in developing components of the plan. In addressing the National Education Goals and plan requirements, each committee of the State Panel and Technology Task Force has collaboratively:

- drafted vision and mission statements,
- identified critical issues related to its area, and
- developed strategies for addressing those issues.

In preparing Missouri's Goals 2000 plan, the State Panel gathered information about current school-improvement activities. The following associations and organizations provided input into the state plan:

- Missouri Association of Elementary School Principals
- Missouri Association of School Administrators
- Missouri Association of School Librarians
- Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals
- Missouri Congress of Parents and Teachers

- Missouri Federation of Teachers and School-Related Personnel
- Missouri National Education Association
- Missouri School Boards Association
- Missouri School Counselors Association
- Missouri State Teachers Association
- Missouri Vocational Association
- Parents as Teachers National Center
- Project Construct National Center
- State Council on Vocational Education

The State Panel worked with other state government agencies in coordinating their efforts to upgrade teaching and learning. The following state agencies worked collaboratively in developing the state plan:

- Department of Corrections
- Budget and Planning
- Labor and Industrial Relations
- Department of Mental Health
- Department of Conservation
- Department of Insurance
- Missouri Highway and Transportation Department
- Department of Social Services
- Department of Revenue
- Department of Higher Education
- Department of Public Safety
- Department of Economic Development

In addition to the input secured in the early stages of plan development, the two panels conducted a statewide public forum at four sites across the state. These

meetings provided an opportunity for citizens to learn more about Goals 2000 and to offer suggestions for the state plan.

In December 1995 the State Improvement Plan (The Show-Me Plan) was submitted to the Governor and State Board of Education and made available for public comment. The Show-Me Plan was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education in February 1996.

The State Technology Plan (The Show-Me Technology Plan) was submitted to the Governor and State Board of Education and made available for public comment in January 1996. In March 1996 the Show-Me Technology Plan was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education.

Both plans have been distributed statewide. Copies of the plans were sent to all school districts, panel and task force members, governmental officials, and to any party requesting a copy. The Show-Me Plan is available on the Department's home page (<http://www.services.dese.state.mo.us/showme-plan/index.html>), The Show-Me Technology Plan is also available on the home page (<http://www.services.dese.state.mo.us/showme-techplan/index.html>).

State reserve program funds were used to support department staff. The Goals 2000 Assistant Director was assigned full-time to organize, implement, and evaluate the work of the panel (1 full-funded). Members of the Curriculum Section (3 split-funded) were provided Goals 2000 funds to assist school districts and other organizations in the process of developing and

implementing the state's content and performance standards (The Show-Me Standards). The Show-Me Standards are available on the Department's home page (<http://www.services.dese.state.mo.us/standards/>).

The Director of the Equity and Urban Education Section (1 full-funded) was provided Goals 2000 funds to support school districts by providing technical assistance and resource information that can be used to assist in the development of gender-equitable and multicultural programs. Professional development opportunities are provided through statewide conferences including the Students At-Risk Conference and the Socialization of the Culturally Diverse Child Conference.

State reserve administrative funds were used to support the administration of the subgrant programs authorized under the Act. Funds were used for salaries, benefits, and necessary expenses. Other expenses included those for printing and mailing grant information and for the work of a peer review committee. Many of these activities will continue in subsequent years.

### **Goals 2000 Statewide Initiatives**

Goals 2000 funds were used to support four projects benefiting school personnel and school districts statewide. The projects are consistent with the State's Show-Me Plan. The projects are summarized below.

### **Educational Development Project: Analysis of Post-Graduate Evaluation**

Consultants from the Educational Development Project (EDP): Analysis of Post-Graduate Evaluation collaborated with DESE in designing and executing a comprehensive analysis of statewide professional development and post-graduate licensure support programs for the professional educator within school districts and subsequent assessment and evaluations of such programs.

### **Educational Development Project: Professional Development / Education Programs**

Consultant from the EDP: Professional Development / Education Programs collaborated with DESE in designing and executing a comprehensive statewide professional education program approval system and preservice teacher assessment. This project is designed to meet the need for information gathering on appropriate models for program approval and preservice teacher assessment, as well as assist in the development of systems, processes, materials, and training modules to support those approval and assessment systems.

### **Practical Parenting Partnerships**

The Practical Parenting Partnerships (PPP) Center is a K-12 family resource/parent education initiative that provides opportunities through local schools for parents, students, educators and other interested community members to consider a variety of issues together, to learn from one another, and to join in cooperative

activities and decision making. The program is designed to support adults in their roles as educators and nurturers of school-age children. Its goal is to help all children become responsible and confident individuals and community members who can function to the best of their abilities in their personal lives, in their educational experiences, and within a complex society. The program also offers opportunities for networks between families, schools, and the community. The PPP Center also provides training, resources, technical assistance, inservice, and networking for school teams implementing PPP and offers parent involvement workshops to other interested schools. Goals 2000 is only one funding source for this project.

### **Project Construct National Center**

The National Center for Project Construct supports educators' implementation of an early childhood education curriculum and assessment. The Center is committed to providing high-quality services that support and promote educational practice based on the constructivist theory and research. The Center advocates for and offers services in support of constructivist education at the prekindergarten, primary, and elementary levels. The Center provides a

comprehensive, ongoing, and participant-centered professional-development program. The Project Construct curriculum provides "hands-on, minds-on" experiences, which assists students to attain deep understanding in the core content areas, while they also learn to work collaboratively with others.

The Center's primary goals are:

- To validate and support Project Construct through a comprehensive research program.
- To develop/refine and disseminate (within and beyond Missouri) Project Construct curriculum and assessment materials for the prekindergarten, primary, and elementary levels.
- To develop/refine and offer (within and beyond Missouri) opportunities for educators at the prekindergarten, primary, and elementary levels.
- To establish and implement a technical assistance and support system for educators who are implementing Project Construct.

Goals 2000 is only one funding source for this project.

## State Progress

The State Panel identified several goals, objectives, and initiatives for the state and its schools to utilize. The following benchmarks have been developed to mark our progress, as a state, toward meeting the eight national

education goals. Each benchmark contains a target date, a measurable goal, and the benchmark's current status.

### The Show-Me Plan Benchmarks

Target Date	Goal I—SCHOOL READINESS	Met	Baseline
<b>Sept. 1997</b>	90 percent of two-year-olds served through public agencies are fully immunized against preventable childhood diseases.	<b>X</b>	64% - 1994 75.5% - 1996 91.2 % - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	65 percent of eligible families are enrolled in the Parents as Teachers program.		42% - 1996 44% - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	75 communities/sites are participating in Caring Community programs.		61 - 1995 92 - 1997

Target Date	Goal II—SCHOOL COMPLETION	Met	Baseline
June 2000	The statewide high school graduation rate is 85%.		75.28% - 1994 75.27% - 1995 75.08% - 1996 74.73% - 1997
June 2000	Statewide, 10,000 Missouri residents have completed their GED each year.		9,021 - 1996 9,451 - 1997
June 2000	The statewide three-year average of high school completion rates of 18- to 24-year-olds, not currently enrolled in high school or below, is 95%		88.0 - 89-91 88.1 - 90-92 88.3 - 91-93 90.0 - 92-94 90.3 - 93-95 88.0 - 94-96

Target Date	Goal III—STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND CITIZENSHIP	Met	Baseline
July 1996	Increase equity across school districts via the Foundation Formula.	X	
June 2000	The number of public school students receiving a College Preparatory Studies Certificate is 15,200.		10,616 - 1995 11,638 - 1996 12,903 - 1997
June 2000	The statewide ACT composite score is 21.8.		21.2 - 1994 21.3 - 1996 21.4 - 1997

<b>June 2000</b>	The statewide performance assessments will be in place for the following areas: Mathematics, Communication Arts, Science, Social Studies, Fine Arts, and Health/Physical Education.		
------------------	---	--	--

<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Goal IV—MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Baseline</b>
<b>June 1999</b>	The statewide performance assessments will be in place for Mathematics and Science.		
<b>June 2000</b>	The statewide ACT Math score is 20.8.		21.5 - 1996 20.9 - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	The statewide ACT Science Reasoning score is 22.		21.6 - 1996 21.6 - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	Locally adopted math and science curriculum, aligned with the Show-Me Standards, is found in schools undergoing an MSIP review.		

<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Goal V—ADULT LITERACY AND LIFELONG LEARNING</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Baseline</b>
<b>June 2000</b>	40,000 citizens are enrolled in 12 or more hours of Adult Basic Education coursework.		34,010 - 1996 35,841 - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	1,400 incarcerates annually pass the GED.		1,045 - 1995 1,103 - 1996 1,725 - 1997

<b>June 2000</b>	12,400 incarcerates are enrolled in academic coursework at correctional facilities.	<b>X</b>	10,150 - 1995 10,897 - 1996 16,800 - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	825 businesses are participating in school-to-work partnerships or activities.		- 1998
<b>June 2000</b>	400 school sites offer adult literacy parent training (ABE & Even Start).		302 - 1996 309 - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	398 school sites offer Community Education.		293 - 1996 293 - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	Best Practices in selected categories of system delivery will be identified and cataloged from School-to-Work activity throughout the state. Initially, information will be gathered in 25 categories, but will be expanded to include additional data as needed.		25 - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	60 local partnerships are operating School-to-Work programs.		15 - 1995 37 - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	150 One-Stop Career Centers are in operation.		0 - 1995 55 - 1997

<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Goal VI—SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Baseline</b>
<b>June 2000</b>	Less than 5 percent of public high school students report using alcohol and/or marijuana at least once at school during the past 30 days.		8% - 1995-alcohol 5% - 1997-alcohol 7% - 1995-marijuana 9% - 1997-marijuana

<b>June 2000</b>	Less than 10 percent of public high school students report being offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months.		20% - 1995 26% - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	Less than 8 percent of public high school students report carrying a weapon on school property during the previous 30 days.		11% - 1995 10% - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	Less than 2 percent of public high school students report staying away from school because they did not feel safe.		4% - 1995 4% - 1997
<b>June 2000</b>	Less than 5 percent of public high school students report being involved in a physical fight on school property during the previous year.		10% - 1995 13% - 1997

<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Goal VII—TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Baseline</b>
<b>June 1995</b>	98 percent of public secondary school teachers hold a teaching certificate in their main teaching assignment.	<b>X</b>	
<b>June 1995</b>	9 Regional Professional Development Centers are established to provide training to teachers in many areas.	<b>X</b>	
<b>July 1996</b>	95 percent of all school districts have a plan for professional development which focuses on improved academic success for all students.	<b>X</b>	
<b>Dec. 1997</b>	Competencies for teacher certification are developed and implemented.	<b>X</b>	
<b>June 1998</b>	The 9 Goals 2000 Education Grant teams have each developed at least 2 strategies that can be replicated at other sites.		
<b>Dec. 1998</b>	New standards for teacher education programs are developed and implemented.		

Target Date	Goal VIII—PARENTAL PARTICIPATION	Met	Baseline
June 1997	DESE provides a broad range of media to inform Missouri parents and families of the State Plan and the Technology Plan.	X	
June 1998	All school districts will develop and make available to the public a district report card in compliance with Senate Bill 380.	X	
June 2000	216,000 families are served by Parents as Teachers.		130,984 - 1995 139,499 - 1996 147,038 - 1997
June 2000	126,000 citizens are members of the Missouri Parent-Teacher Association.		125,182 - 1995 120,525 - 1996 120,597 - 1997

Target Date	GENERAL AREAS	Met	Baseline
June 1993	Outstanding Schools Act (OSA) establishes a process for the Show-Me Standards, frameworks for curriculum development, and statewide performance-based student assessment.	X	
June 1993	OSA creates a process for waiving state rules and regulations.	X	
June 1993	OSA establishes a public reporting requirement for the State Board and local schools.	X	
June 1993	OSA establishes the New Foundation Formula for school funding.	X	
June 1993	OSA establishes a local 1% set-aside for professional development.	X	
Jan. 1996	State Board of Education approves the Show-Me Standards.	X	
Nov. 1997	Local schools have adopted written curriculum in one core subject area and have developed a timeline for the adoption of the remaining five core subject areas aligned with the Show-Me Standards.	X	

Target Date	GOALS 2000 AND CONSOLIDATED STATE PLAN	Met	Baseline
July 1994	Goals 2000 Planning Grant and Technology Planning Grant submitted to the U.S. Secretary of Education.	X	
Aug. 1994	Goals 2000 Planning Grant and Technology Planning Grant approved by the U.S. Secretary of Education.	X	
Jan. 1995	Goals 2000 State Panel and Technology Task Force appointed.	X	
April 1995	Goals 2000 subgrant applications sent to all public school districts.	X	
Nov. 1995	Goals 2000 subgrant applications submitted by public school districts to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.	X	
Dec. 1995	Goals 2000 subgrants awarded.	X	
Dec. 1995	Goals 2000 State Improvement Plan, The Show-Me Plan, approved by the Missouri State Board of Education.	X	
Feb. 1996	Goals 2000 State Technology Plan, The Show-Me Technology Plan, approved by the Missouri State Board of Education.	X	
March 1996	Consolidated State Plan Committee appointed.	X	
May 1996	Goals 2000 preservice/professional development subgrant applications sent to all public school districts, teacher training institutions, and regional professional development centers.	X	
May 1996	Consolidated State Plan approved by the Missouri State Board of Education.	X	
May 1996	Consolidated State Plan submitted to the U.S. Secretary of Education.	X	
Aug. 1996	Goals 2000 preservice/professional development subgrants awarded.	X	
Feb. 1997	Goals 2000 State Improvement Plan, The Show-Me Plan, approved by the U.S. Secretary of Education.	X	
April 1997	Consolidated State Plan approved by the U.S. Secretary of Education.	X	

## Missouri Educational Technology Benchmarks

Target Date	GOAL I--ALL MISSOURI STUDENTS AND TEACHERS WILL HAVE ACCESS TO MODERN COMPUTERS.	Met	Baseline
June 2002	All Missouri school districts will have a current Local Technology Plan as reported on an annual Technology Survey or via Core Data.		474 of 525 districts (1997 Technology Census)
June 2002	Missouri will attain a computer to student ratio of 5:1.		7:1 (1997 Technology Census)
Dec. 2002	All Missouri classrooms will have at least one modern computer.		To begin collecting in 1998

Target Date	GOAL II--ALL SCHOOLS AND CLASSROOMS IN MISSOURI WILL BE LINKED TO THE INFORMATION SUPERHIGHWAY.	Met	Baseline
June 1998	All Missouri school districts will be connected to the Internet.		500 of 525 (MOREnet)
June 2002	All Missouri school buildings will be connected to the Internet.		80% of 2132 (1997 Technology Census)
Dec. 2002	All Missouri classrooms will be connected to the Internet.		To begin collecting in 1997-98
Dec. 2002	At least 80 Missouri communities will establish community information networks.		To begin collecting in 1997-98
June 2002	All Missouri school teachers will use Internet access to collect educational resources.		14% (1997 Technology Census)
June 2002	Missouri will attain a student Internet-connected computer to student ratio of 12:1.		24:1 (1997 Technology Census)
Dec. 2002	80% of Missouri school districts will participate in the FCC's E-Rate.		To begin collecting in 1997-98

Target Date	GOAL III--ALL MISSOURI TEACHERS WILL BE TRAINED TO HELP STUDENTS LEARN THROUGH COMPUTERS AND THE INFORMATION SUPERHIGHWAY.	Met	Baseline
June 2002	All Missouri school buildings will have more than 50% of their teachers trained on instructional applications of the Internet.		27% of buildings (1997 Technology Census)
June 2002	All Missouri school buildings will have more than 50% of their students trained on how to use desktop computers.		76% of buildings (1997 Technology Census)
June 2002	All Missouri school buildings will have more than 50% of their students trained on instructional applications of the Internet.		16% of buildings (1997 Technology Census)
Dec. 2002	All Missouri students will be computer literate by age 12.		To begin collecting in 1997-98

Target Date	GOAL IV--HIGH QUALITY SOFTWARE AND ON-LINE RESOURCES WILL BE PART OF THE CURRICULUM IN EVERY MISSOURI SCHOOL.	Met	Baseline
June 2002	All Missouri school teachers will incorporate student Internet access in their classrooms as part of classroom instruction.		6% (1997 Technology Census)
June 2002	All Missouri buildings will have more than 50% of their students using the Internet in their classrooms as part of classroom instruction.		6% (1997 Technology Census)
June 2002	All Missouri buildings will have more than 50% of their students using Internet to collect educational resources or to do research for class.		12% (1997 Technology Census)
Dec. 2002	All Missouri school districts will integrate technology into student learning as measured by the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), Standard 7.5		To begin collecting in 1997-98
Dec. 2002	All Missouri school districts will integrate the software and online resources available through the Missouri Research and Education Network.		To begin collecting in 1997-98

Target Date	GOAL V--MISSOURI WILL INVOLVE AND COLLABORATE WITH PARTNERS WHO CAN HELP IMPROVE THE TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESS WITH THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY.	Met	Baseline
Dec. 2002	Over half of all Missouri school districts will form partnerships with business and higher education to help with technology planning, implementation, and/or evaluation.		To begin collecting in 1997-98
Dec. 2002	Over half of all Missouri school districts will take advantage of purchasing technology products and services through the State's technology contract.		To begin collecting in 1997-98

## Local Activities

The Department made competitive grants to local public school districts for the purpose of developing and implementing local improvement plans. For the 1997 Grant Cycle, 42 first-year subgrants were awarded to 69 school districts either singularly or in consortium. The award amount (\$6,000-\$36,000) was contingent upon the size of the district. Local plans were developed consistent with the Show-Me Plan and with the Missouri School Improvement Plan for their district.

Districts competed for continuation funding based on the quality of their plans and implementation strategies. The

Department awarded 61 continuation grants to 72 school districts either singularly or in consortium for the 1997 Grant Cycle. The award amount (\$20,000-\$62,500) was contingent upon the size of the district.

State totals for Local Improvement, Planning and Implementation grants can be found in the section titled Missouri's Goals 2000 Grant Summary for the 1996 and 1997 Grant Cycles on page 3 of this report. Detailed summaries, organized by area of emphasis, for each grant are found in the following section.

## Goals 2000 Local Activities

Goals 2000 Subgrantee	Notes	Approved Amount	Project Goals												
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
FIRST YEAR - Local Reform															
Governance															
1. Dunklin R-V		10,650					✓	✓						✓	
2. Francis Howell R-III		36,000			✓		✓	✓						✓	
3. Affton 101		21,276					✓	✓						✓	
Preservice / Professional Development															
4. Gasconade Co. R-II		11,990			✓					✓	✓	T			
5. Chillicothe R-II		18,000		✓					✓	✓		T		✓	
6. Hannibal 60		27,000	M,L,S,H,O	M,L,S,H ,O			✓			M,L,S,H,O		T		✓	
7. Moberly		17,502			✓				C	L		T		✓	
8. Lindbergh R-VIII		27,000	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓				✓	
9. Parkway C-2		24,000	S	S						S		T		✓	
10. Plato R-V		9,000	S,M	S,M	✓					S,M				✓	

## Key:

- Develop/implement standards for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
- Develop/implement assessments for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
- Leverage other funds/reform efforts
- Improve collaboration and/or develop networks: (H = with higher education institutions, E = with educators, C = with other members of the community)
- Restructure the learning environment
- Restructure the management/administration of the school or district
- Expand the use of technology in: (P = professional development, C = curriculum and/or instruction in the classroom, O = other areas, ✓ = area not specified)
- Improve instruction and/or curriculum in: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
- Increase parent involvement/parenting skills
- Improve specific skills or content knowledge of: (T = current teachers, S = student teachers/future teachers)
- Provide additional, targeted services (e. g., social, academic) to students
- Conduct research, planning, and development activities that support school reform/improvement
- Other

## Notes

F = Fiscal agent (see list at end of section)

G = Governance

CA = Curriculum and Assessment

PPD = Preservice/Professional Development

COP = Community Outreach and Participation

HHS = Health and Human Services

Goals 2000 Subgrantee	Notes	Approved Amount	Project Goals												
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<b>Curriculum and Assessment</b>															
11. Shell Knob 78		9,000		✓	✓					✓		T		✓	
12. Southern Boone Co. R-I		18,000	✓		✓					✓					
13. Oak Ridge R-VI		9,000	✓	✓	✓					✓	✓			✓	
14. Keytesville R-III		9,000	M,✓	✓	✓					✓				✓	
15. Missouri City 56		8,997	L	L		C				L	✓			✓	
16. Cole Co. R-II		9,000	S		✓					S		T		✓	
17. Crawford Co. R-I		18,000	✓	✓					C	✓		T		✓	
18. Lonedell R-XIV		8,712	M,L	M,L	✓	C				M,L		T		✓	
19. Sullivan C-2		18,000	✓	✓	✓					✓				✓	
20. Sunrise R-IX		8,000	L,M	L,M	✓	C				L,M				✓	
21. East Prairie R-II		15,150	✓		✓		✓					T	✓	✓	
22. Moniteau Co. C-1		9,000	S,✓	S,✓	✓					S,✓		T		✓	
23. Paris R-II		18,000	L,M,O	M,L,O						M,L,O					
24. Neosho R-V	FA1	225,000	M,L,S,H,O		✓					M,L,S,H,O				✓	

**Key:**

1. Develop/implement standards for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
2. Develop/implement assessments for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
3. Leverage other funds/reform efforts
4. Improve collaboration and/or develop networks: (H = with higher education institutions, E = with educators, C = with other members of the community)
5. Restructure the learning environment
6. Restructure the management/administration of the school or district
7. Expand the use of technology in: (P = professional development, C = curriculum and/or instruction in the classroom, O = other areas, ✓ = area not specified)
8. Improve instruction and/or curriculum in: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
9. Increase parent involvement/parenting skills
10. Improve specific skills or content knowledge of: (T = current teachers, S = student teachers/future teachers)
11. Provide additional, targeted services (e. g., social, academic) to students
12. Conduct research, planning, and development activities that support school reform/improvement
13. Other

**Notes**

F = Fiscal agent (see list at end of section)

G = Governance

CA = Curriculum and Assessment

PPD = Preservice/Professional Development

COP = Community Outreach and Participation

HHS = Health and Human Services

Goals 2000 Subgrantee	Notes	Approved Amount	Project Goals												
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
25. Perry Co. 32		18,000	✓		✓				C	L,O,✓				✓	
26. Rolla 31		27,000	L,M,S,H		✓					L,M,S,H				✓	
27. Renick R-V		9,000	M		✓					M		T		✓	
28. Kirkwood R-VII		27,000	M,L,H	M,L,H	✓					M,L,H		T		✓	
29. Bayless		17,963	S							S		T		✓	
30. Valley Park		18,000	S	S	✓					S		T		✓	
31. Marshall	FA2	165,000	✓	✓	✓					✓		T		✓	
32. Advance R-IV		6,000	L							L		T		✓	
33. Scott Co. R-IV		17,439	M,S	M,S	✓					M,S		T	✓	✓	
34. Summersville R-II		17,990	✓							✓				✓	
35. Kingston K-14		18,000	✓	✓	✓				P,O	✓			✓	✓	
36. Missouri School for the Blind		9,000	✓							✓				✓	
<b>Health and Human Services</b>															
37. Holt Co. R-II		5,902			H,C			C	O				✓		
38. Iron Co. C-4		9,000				✓	✓		O		✓		✓	✓	

**Key:**

1. Develop/implement standards for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
2. Develop/implement assessments for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
3. Leverage other funds/reform efforts
4. Improve collaboration and/or develop networks: (H = with higher education institutions, E = with educators, C = with other members of the community)
5. Restructure the learning environment
6. Restructure the management/administration of the school or district
7. Expand the use of technology in: (P = professional development, C = curriculum and/or instruction in the classroom, O = other areas, ✓ = area not specified)
8. Improve instruction and/or curriculum in: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
9. Increase parent involvement/parenting skills
10. Improve specific skills or content knowledge of: (T = current teachers, S = student teachers/future teachers)
11. Provide additional, targeted services (e. g., social, academic) to students
12. Conduct research, planning, and development activities that support school reform/improvement
13. Other

**Notes**

F = Fiscal agent (see list at end of section)

G = Governance

CA = Curriculum and Assessment

PPD = Preservice/Professional Development

COP = Community Outreach and Participation

HHS = Health and Human Services

Goals 2000 Subgrantee	Notes	Approved Amount	Project Goals												
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
39. Avilla R-XIII		6,000		✓									✓	✓	
40. Richmond R-XVI		18,000			✓		✓						✓	✓	
41. Jennings		27,000			✓					O			✓	✓	
42. Licking R-VIII		17,957					✓						✓	✓	
<b>FIRST YEAR SUBGRANTS</b>		<b>1,019,528</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>

SUBSEQUENT YEAR - Local Reform															
Preservice / Professional Development															
1. Independence 30		61,135	M,L		✓			✓	C	O,M,L		T		✓	
2. Portageville		37,500	✓	✓	✓		✓		C,O	✓		T		✓	
3. Gideon 37		24,800	✓	✓	✓	E,C			C	✓		T		✓	
4. St. James R-I		28,602	✓		✓				P,C	✓		T			
5. Wentzville R-IV		49,998			✓					✓		T			

**Key:**

1. Develop/implement standards for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
2. Develop/implement assessments for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
3. Leverage other funds/reform efforts
4. Improve collaboration and/or develop networks: (H = with higher education institutions, E = with educators, C = with other members of the community)
5. Restructure the learning environment
6. Restructure the management/administration of the school or district
7. Expand the use of technology in: (P = professional development, C = curriculum and/or instruction in the classroom, O = other areas, ✓ = area not specified)
8. Improve instruction and/or curriculum in: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
9. Increase parent involvement/parenting skills
10. Improve specific skills or content knowledge of: (T = current teachers, S = student teachers/future teachers)
11. Provide additional, targeted services (e. g., social, academic) to students
12. Conduct research, planning, and development activities that support school reform/improvement
13. Other

**Notes**

F = Fiscal agent (see list at end of section)

G = Governance

CA = Curriculum and Assessment

PPD = Preservice/Professional Development

COP = Community Outreach and Participation

HHS = Health and Human Services

Goals 2000 Subgrantee	Notes	Approved Amount	Project Goals												
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<b>Curriculum and Assessment</b>															
6. Kirksville R-III		20,000	S	S	✓					S		T		✓	
7. Breckenridge R-I		18,400	M,L	M,L	✓				C	M,L		T		✓	
8. Camdenton R-III		42,400	M,L,S,H	M,L,S,H					C	M,L,S,H		T			
9. Tina Avalon R-II	FA3	150,000	✓	✓	✓				C	✓		T			
10. Stockton R-I		37,255	M,H,O	M,H,O	✓					M,H,O	✓	T		✓	✓
11. North Kansas City 74		46,000	✓	✓						✓		T		✓	
12. Blackwater R-II		25,000	✓		✓				C	✓		T	✓		
13. Dallas Co. R-I	FA4	100,000	✓	✓	✓				C	✓		T		✓	
14. Ava R-I		37,435			✓		✓	✓	C	✓			✓	✓	
15. Clinton		37,000	L	L			✓		C				✓		
16. Arcadia Valley R-II		19,940	M		✓				C	M			✓	✓	
17. Blue Springs R-IV		45,443	✓		✓		✓			M,L,✓	✓	T	✓	✓	
18. Grandview C-4		46,295	L		✓	C	✓		C,O	✓	✓			✓	

**Key:**

1. Develop/implement standards for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
2. Develop/implement assessments for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
3. Leverage other funds/reform efforts
4. Improve collaboration and/or develop networks: (H = with higher education institutions, E = with educators, C = with other members of the community)
5. Restructure the learning environment
6. Restructure the management/administration of the school or district
7. Expand the use of technology in: (P = professional development, C = curriculum and/or instruction in the classroom, O = other areas, ✓ = area not specified)
8. Improve instruction and/or curriculum in: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
9. Increase parent involvement/parenting skills
10. Improve specific skills or content knowledge of: (T = current teachers, S = student teachers/future teachers)
11. Provide additional, targeted services (e. g., social, academic) to students
12. Conduct research, planning, and development activities that support school reform/improvement
13. Other

**Notes**

F = Fiscal agent (see list at end of section)

G = Governance

CA = Curriculum and Assessment

PPD = Preservice/Professional Development

COP = Community Outreach and Participation

HHS = Health and Human Services

Goals 2000 Subgrantee	Notes	Approved Amount	Project Goals												
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
19. Carl Junction R-I		37,500	✓	✓	✓				✓			T			
20. Northwest R-I		50,000			✓				C	✓					
21. Grandview R-II		35,605			✓				C	✓		T	✓	✓	
22. Windsor C-1		35,750	✓		✓				C	M,L,S,H				✓	
23. Knox Co. R-I		20,100	M,S,L,H,O	M					C	M,L,S,H,O		T			
24. Santa Fe R-X		20,000	✓	✓						✓		T			
25. Miller R-II		37,456	L	L	✓				C	L		T		✓	
26. Winfield R-IV		27,395	L,H		✓					L,H		T		✓	
27. Brookfield R-III		37,500			✓		✓		C,O			T		✓	
28. Macon Co. R-I		37,500			✓				C	M,L,S					
29. Macon Co. R-IV		25,000	✓	✓	✓				C	✓		T			
30. Palmyra R-I		37,500	✓	✓	✓	C				✓	✓	T		✓	
31. Risco R-II		24,954			✓				C	✓		T			
32. Osage Co. R-II	FA6	87,500	M,S,L		✓				C,O	✓		T	✓	✓	
33. Lutie R-VI		24,975	✓	✓	✓	E	✓		C,O	✓				✓	
34. Laquey R-V		37,500	M,S	M,S					C	M,S		T			

**Key:**

1. Develop/implement standards for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
2. Develop/implement assessments for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
3. Leverage other funds/reform efforts
4. Improve collaboration and/or develop networks: (H = with higher education institutions, E = with educators, C = with other members of the community)
5. Restructure the learning environment
6. Restructure the management/administration of the school or district
7. Expand the use of technology in: (P = professional development, C = curriculum and/or instruction in the classroom, O = other areas, ✓ = area not specified)
8. Improve instruction and/or curriculum in: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
9. Increase parent involvement/parenting skills
10. Improve specific skills or content knowledge of: (T = current teachers, S = student teachers/future teachers)
11. Provide additional, targeted services (e. g., social, academic) to students
12. Conduct research, planning, and development activities that support school reform/improvement
13. Other

**Notes**

F = Fiscal agent (see list at end of section)

G = Governance

CA = Curriculum and Assessment

PPD = Preservice/Professional Development

COP = Community Outreach and Participation

HHS = Health and Human Services

Goals 2000 Subgrantee	Notes	Approved Amount	Project Goals												
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
35. Farmington R-VII		50,000	✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	T		✓	
36. Ritenour		50,000	L,M	L,✓	✓				C	L,M,✓			✓		
37. Miami R-I		24,957	✓	✓	✓				C	✓				✓	
38. Winona R-III		20,042	✓	✓						✓				✓	
39. Puxico R-VIII		37,493			✓					L		T			
40. Reeds Spring R-IV		31,205	✓							✓			✓		
41. Hollister R-V		33,888	M,L,H	M,L,H	✓				C	M,L,H		T			
42. Nevada R-V		49,800	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓		T			
<b>Community Outreach and Participation</b>															
43. Cooper C. R-IV		13,100	✓		✓	C			C,O		✓				
44. Cooper Co. C-4		25,000	✓						C,O		✓				
45. Steelville R-III		35,710					✓		C	✓			✓		
46. Howard Co. R-II	FA5	87,500			✓	C	✓		C	✓			✓	✓	
47. West Plains R-VII		50,000			✓	C					✓				
48. Bernie R-XIII		22,941			✓					✓	✓		✓		

**Key:**

1. Develop/implement standards for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
2. Develop/implement assessments for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
3. Leverage other funds/reform efforts
4. Improve collaboration and/or develop networks: (H = with higher education institutions, E = with educators, C = with other members of the community)
5. Restructure the learning environment
6. Restructure the management/administration of the school or district
7. Expand the use of technology in: (P = professional development, C = curriculum and/or instruction in the classroom, O = other areas, ✓ = area not specified)
8. Improve instruction and/or curriculum in: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
9. Increase parent involvement/parenting skills
10. Improve specific skills or content knowledge of: (T = current teachers, S = student teachers/future teachers)
11. Provide additional, targeted services (e. g., social, academic) to students
12. Conduct research, planning, and development activities that support school reform/improvement
13. Other

**Notes**

F = Fiscal agent (see list at end of section)

G = Governance

CA = Curriculum and Assessment

PPD = Preservice/Professional Development

COP = Community Outreach and Participation

HHS = Health and Human Services

Goals 2000 Subgrantee	Notes	Approved Amount	Project Goals												
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<b>Health and Human Services</b>															
49. Adair Co. R-II		15,000			✓								✓		
50. Columbia 93		62,483										T	✓		
51. Mountain View-Birch Tree R-III		37,500	✓		✓		✓		C	✓	✓			✓	
52. Lebanon R-III		50,000	O	O	✓				C,O	O	✓		✓		
53. Bradleyville R-I		25,000							O				✓		✓
54. Manes R-V		25,000									✓		✓		✓
<b>Multiple Areas</b>															
55. Poplar Bluff R-I	CA/COP	36,800	M,L,S,H	M,L,S,H	✓	✓		✓	C	M,L,S,H	✓	T			
56. Midway R-I	PPD/CA	25,000	H,S,O	H,S,O	✓					H,S,O		T		✓	
57. Kingsville R-I	CA / H&HS	25,000	✓		✓				C,O	✓	✓		✓		
58. Warrensburg R-VI	PPD/CA/COP	50,000	M,L,S	M,L,S			✓			M,L,S	✓	T		✓	

**Key:**

1. Develop/implement standards for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
2. Develop/implement assessments for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
3. Leverage other funds/reform efforts
4. Improve collaboration and/or develop networks: (H = with higher education institutions, E = with educators, C = with other members of the community)
5. Restructure the learning environment
6. Restructure the management/administration of the school or district
7. Expand the use of technology in: (P = professional development, C = curriculum and/or instruction in the classroom, O = other areas, ✓ = area not specified)
8. Improve instruction and/or curriculum in: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
9. Increase parent involvement/parenting skills
10. Improve specific skills or content knowledge of: (T = current teachers, S = student teachers/future teachers)
11. Provide additional, targeted services (e. g., social, academic) to students
12. Conduct research, planning, and development activities that support school reform/improvement
13. Other

**Notes**

F = Fiscal agent (see list at end of section)

G = Governance

CA = Curriculum and Assessment

PPD = Preservice/Professional Development

COP = Community Outreach and Participation

HHS = Health and Human Services

Goals 2000 Subgrantee	Notes	Approved Amount	Project Goals												
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
59. Orrick R-XI	CA/ H&HS	24,899			✓				C,O		✓			✓	✓
60. Hurley R-I	CA/COP	20,000	✓	✓	✓	C				L	✓				
61. Potosi R-III	CA/ H&HS	49,430	✓	✓	✓					✓		T	✓		
<b>SUBSEQUENT SUBGRANTS</b>		2,381,186	44	30	47	9	12	3	39	50	17	35	19	28	4
<b>ALL LOCAL REFORM SUBGRANTS</b>		3,400,714	73	51	74	13	21	7	46	83	21	53	28	66	4

**Key:**

1. Develop/implement standards for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
2. Develop/implement assessments for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
3. Leverage other funds/reform efforts
4. Improve collaboration and/or develop networks: (H = with higher education institutions, E = with educators, C = with other members of the community)
5. Restructure the learning environment
6. Restructure the management/administration of the school or district
7. Expand the use of technology in: (P = professional development, C = curriculum and/or instruction in the classroom, O = other areas, ✓ = area not specified)
8. Improve instruction and/or curriculum in: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
9. Increase parent involvement/parenting skills
10. Improve specific skills or content knowledge of: (T = current teachers, S = student teachers/future teachers)
11. Provide additional, targeted services (e. g., social, academic) to students
12. Conduct research, planning, and development activities that support school reform/improvement
13. Other

**Notes**

F = Fiscal agent (see list at end of section)

G = Governance

CA = Curriculum and Assessment

PPD = Preservice/Professional Development

COP = Community Outreach and Participation

HHS = Health and Human Services

Goals 2000	Approved	Project Goals												
Subgrantee	Amount	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<b>PRESERVICE EDUCATION SUBGRANTS</b>														
1. Warrensburg R-VI	19,208				E,H				L		T,S		✓	
2. Cape Girardeau 63	14,683				E,H				O		T,S		✓	
3. Lebanon R-III	50,000				E,H				O		T,S		✓	
4. Pattonville R-III	16,333				E,H				H		T,S		✓	
5. Kirksville R-III	16,000				E,H				M		T,S		✓	
6. Strafford R-VI	39,408				E,H				S		T,S		✓	
7. Hickman Mills C-1	26,530		✓		E,H				✓		T,S		✓	
8. Independence 30	26,680				E,H		✓				T,S		✓	
9. St. Joseph	23,357				E,H				O		T,S		✓	
<b>PRESERVICE EDUCATION SUBGRANTS</b>	<b>232,199</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>ALL SUBGRANTS</b>	<b>3,623,913</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>4</b>

**Key:**

1. Develop/implement standards for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
2. Develop/implement assessments for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
3. Leverage other funds/reform efforts
4. Improve collaboration and/or develop networks: (H = with higher education institutions, E = with educators, C = with other members of the community)
5. Restructure the learning environment
6. Restructure the management/administration of the school or district
7. Expand the use of technology in: (P = professional development, C = curriculum and/or instruction in the classroom, O = other areas, ✓ = area not specified)
8. Improve instruction and/or curriculum in: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
9. Increase parent involvement/parenting skills
10. Improve specific skills or content knowledge of: (T = current teachers, S = student teachers/future teachers)
11. Provide additional, targeted services (e. g., social, academic) to students
12. Conduct research, planning, and development activities that support school reform/improvement
13. Other

**Notes**

F = Fiscal agent (see list at end of section)

G = Governance

CA = Curriculum and Assessment

PPD = Preservice/Professional Development

COP = Community Outreach and Participation

HHS = Health and Human Services

**First Year Consortia**

<b>FA1</b>	073-108	Neosho R-V - Fiscal Agent
	006-103	Golden City R-III
	020-002	El Dorado Springs R-II
	022-091	Billings R-IV
	029-002	Dadeville R-II
	034-122	Plainview R-VIII
	039-135	Ash Grove R-IV
	053-112	Gasconade C-4
	055-105	Pierce City R-VI
	073-108	Westview C-6
	075-086	Oregon-Howell R-III
	104-043	Crane R-III
	106-003	Forsyth R-III
	106-004	Branson R-IV
	112-099	Niangua R-V
	112-102	Marshfield R-I
<b>FA2</b>	097-129	Marshall - Fiscal Agent
	007-124	Rich Hill R-IV
	019-140	Strasburg C-3
	019-147	East Lynne 40
	042-111	Henry Co. R-I
	043-002	Wheatland R-II
	043-004	Hermitage R-IV
	051-152	Holden R-III
	051-153	Chilhowee R-IV
	051-154	Johnson Co. R-VII
	054-043	Wellington-Napoleon R-IX
	080-116	Pettis Co. R-V
	080-119	Smithton R-VI

**Subsequent Year Consortia**

<b>FA3</b>	017-022	Tina Avalon R-II - Fiscal Agent
	017-121	Hale R-I
	017-124	Bosworth R-V
	017-126	Norborne R-VIII
	058-108	Meadville R-IV
	089-077	Stet R-XV
<b>FA4</b>	030-093	Dallas Co. R-I - Fiscal Agent
	043-001	Hickory Co. R-I
	084-003	Halfway R-III
<b>FA5</b>	045-078	Howard Co. R-II - Fiscal Agent
	045-076	New Franklin R-I
	045-077	Fayette R-III
<b>FA6</b>	076-082	Osage Co. R-II - Fiscal Agent
	066-104	St. Elizabeth R-IV
	076-082	Osage Co. R-I

**Key:**

1. Develop/implement standards for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
2. Develop/implement assessments for: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
3. Leverage other funds/reform efforts
4. Improve collaboration and/or develop networks: (H = with higher education institutions, E = with educators, C = with other members of the community)
5. Restructure the learning environment
6. Restructure the management/administration of the school or district
7. Expand the use of technology in: (P = professional development, C = curriculum and/or instruction in the classroom, O = other areas, ✓ = area not specified)
8. Improve instruction and/or curriculum in: (M = math, L = language arts, S = science, H = history/social studies, O = other subjects, ✓ = subject not specified)
9. Increase parent involvement/parenting skills
10. Improve specific skills or content knowledge of: (T = current teachers, S = student teachers/future teachers)
11. Provide additional, targeted services (e. g., social, academic) to students
12. Conduct research, planning, and development activities that support school reform/improvement
13. Other

**Notes**

F = Fiscal agent (see list at end of section)

G = Governance

CA = Curriculum and Assessment

PPD = Preservice/Professional Development

COP = Community Outreach and Participation

HHS = Health and Human Services

## **Preservice Education Grants**

The Department issued Requests For Proposals (RFPs) under a competitive, peer-review process in May 1996. Local school districts, in cooperation with higher education institutions or nonprofit organizations, and Regional Professional Development Centers were asked to improve preservice education in a manner consistent with the Show-Me Plan and support continuing and sustained professional development related to the Show-Me Plan. Each project is comprised of a team of collaborators representing a school district (or consortia of school districts), community representatives, the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences from institutions of higher education, and one or more of the Regional Professional Development Centers. Collaborators are designing and implementing plans to simultaneously support the school's reform

efforts and redesign the teacher education programs. The district(s) will evolve as a site for the continuous improvement of teaching and learning of preservice teachers, school personnel, and college/university faculty.

State totals for Preservice Education grants can be found in the section titled Missouri's Goals 2000 Grant Summary for the 1996 and 1997 Grant Cycles on page 3 of this report. Since August of 1996, each team in one of the nine areas has been actively planning and implementing new activities to support the school's reform efforts and redesign the teacher education programs. Their activities and progress are summarized below

## **COMMUNICATION ARTS PROJECT**

### **Improvement of Teaching in the Communication Arts**

**Overview:** A professional development school partnership has been established between Clinton School District, Warrensburg School District, Central Missouri State University, and the Central Regional Professional Development Center in fostering exemplary programs in Communication Arts and teacher education. Preservice teachers are to receive a year-long internship with experienced teachers in the public schools along

with a field-based integrated methods component taught at the school sites. Participating classroom teachers receive training in teaching and mentoring strategies, including an intensive program to meet the Show-Me Standards in Communication Arts. The partnership also boosts learning for K-12 students in Communication Arts by placing two or three preservice teachers in a classroom. Through the creation of this "teaching

school,” the partnership has the potential to empower and energize all participants and promote teaching as a true profession. It is a true “win-win” collaboration as classroom teachers gain professional assistance in the classrooms, preservice teachers observe and participate in authentic instruction and management, and university professors update knowledge of the school setting by observing, teaching, and researching in the public school classroom.

**Program Activities:** A four-day Common Knowledge Base Institute was conducted in August involving approximately 50 participants from Warrensburg, Clinton, and CMSU centering on a shared vision, a common knowledge base and language, and shared knowledge of teaching strategies. Currently methods classes are being taught at four school sites with classroom teachers participating. Weekly and monthly meetings are employed in keeping communication, planning, and assessment ongoing. Preservice teachers are working with K-12 students on a one-to-one basis and in small group work as theory is being put into practice. School faculties are adopting preservice teachers as members of the partnership work together as equals. University faculty are working with classroom teachers as they jointly instruct both preservice teachers and students K-12. A concerted emphasis is being placed upon Communication Skills across the curriculum.

Teachers are attending workshops conducted by national consultants in addressing Communication Skills and the Show-Me Standards for Missouri.

**Long-Term Goals:** Plans are to train and integrate more university and classroom teachers into the partnership. A continued emphasis will be placed upon preservice students to remain at one school site throughout their total training experience. Attempts will be made to minimize scheduling problems between the public schools and the university. Within budget constraints, additional visits to other PDS programs will broaden our horizon. Attendance at appropriate conferences will also assist in the integration of communication skills across the curriculum. The partnership also plans to seek assistance with program evaluation, perhaps using Dr. Jean Morrow at Emporia State University.

### **Communication Arts Project Partners**

Clinton School District  
Warrensburg R-VI School District - Fiscal Agent  
Central Missouri State University  
Central Regional Professional Development Center

**1997 Grant Cycle Approved Amount: \$19,208**

## FINE ARTS PROJECT

The "Introductory Workshops" had a positive effect upon the attitudes of a variety of people concerning the arts and their value in the school curriculum. Extensive dialogue between teachers and administrators in the elementary schools and university preservice faculty has resulted and will continue to result in adaptations to and changes in the present preservice curriculum.

The months of July and August were spent in a collaborative effort to design a new course to be offered to all undergraduate preservice elementary teachers. The 16-week course will be team taught by faculty in the departments of music, art, theater, and dance and will emphasize the concepts and techniques of integration of the arts into the curriculum. Students will be required to work with an arts specialist and a classroom teacher in a targeted elementary school in planning and teaching a unit that integrates at least two art forms with another subject area.

Members of the Management Team visited an exemplary elementary school program in Dallas where integration of the arts was the primary factor in a significant positive increase in academic scores on nationally normed tests.

Three one-hour graduate classes have been offered this semester to classroom teachers, arts specialists, and administrators. Course titles were as follows:

"Integrating the Arts: A Philosophically Sound and Research-Based Educational Approach Aligned with the Show-Me Standards;" "Applying Gardner's Multiple Intelligence Model to the Integration of the Arts;" and "Native American Culture Revealed Through Visual Arts, Music, Dance and Drama."

Phase II of the project is developing according to plans, with preservice student, classroom teacher, school administrator, and local teacher organization reactions being extremely positive.

### **Fine Arts Project Partners**

Cape Girardeau 63 School District - Fiscal Agent  
St. Louis City School District  
Harris-Stowe State College  
Southeast Missouri State University  
Missouri Alliance for Arts Education  
Southeast Regional Professional Development Center

**1997 Grant Cycle Approved Amount: \$14,683**

## HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROJECT

The Health and Physical Education Goals 2000 project focused upon preservice has involved eleven public school districts and eight colleges and universities. In this initial year of planning, investigation, and observation, the partnership has aspired to determine what is at present happening in Health and Physical Education, what appears to be strengths/weaknesses and what proposals the partnership might create to improve Health and Physical Education preservice. The partnership has met at least once per month since February of 1997 and has produced a notebook detailing each activity and the individuals involved. Additionally, members of the partnership have attended workshops both in state and out of state and have created a model for preservice in Health and Physical Education which was presented to DESE officials in October 1997. Numerous collaborations with health officials, agencies, and groups have assisted the public schools and institutions of higher education in the production of this teaching model.

### **Health And Physical Education Project Partners**

Lebanon R-III School District - Fiscal Agent  
Springfield R-XII School District  
Waynesville R-VI School District  
School of the Osage R-II School District

Monett R-I School District  
Neosho R-V School District  
Republic R-III School District  
Green Co. R-VIII School District - Rogersville  
Carthage R-IX School District  
Lindbergh R-VIII School District  
Greenwood Lab School  
Southwest Missouri State University  
Drury College  
Missouri Southern College  
Central Missouri State University  
University of Missouri-St. Louis  
Evangel College  
College of the Ozarks  
Southwest Baptist University  
Southwest Regional Professional Development Center  
Southwest Missouri State University  
Governor's Council on Fitness  
Quality Physical Education  
Initiative of AAHPERD  
Exemplary Programs in Physical Education -  
MAHPHERD

**1997 Grant Cycle Approved Amount: \$50,000**

## MATHEMATICS PROJECT

### THE GOALS 2000 MATHEMATICS PROJECT

(Making Advancements in Teacher Training Happen by Encouraging More Active Technology usage, Instructional techniques, and Collaborative Strategies) is organized around the Continuous Improvement Model which includes the collection of data, analysis and evaluation of data, broad-based conversation and consensus building, implementation of decisions, further collection of data, and a continuation of the cycle. A statewide advisory committee met in December to begin developing the mission statement and objectives for the project. The steering committee meets frequently and has continued the refinement process. The broad goals are: (a) to design and implement specific improvements in K-12 preservice teacher training in the mathematical sciences, (b) to plan and carry out professional development activities for both practicing and preservice teachers, (c) to increase participation of preservice and practicing teachers in collaborative activities, and (d) to instill a level of knowledge and comfort in both preservice and practicing teachers in designing and integrating technological applications that will enhance mathematics instruction for all students.

The implementation plan for this project received final approval on June 10, 1997. Details of the plan, updates of all activities, and comments regarding the project can be found at our web site, ([www.truman.edu/academics/ed/math/granthome.html](http://www.truman.edu/academics/ed/math/granthome.html)).

Below are a few examples of the partnership's current activities:

- The partnership has held several meetings of university faculty, school district personnel, and preservice teachers to identify specific activities (currently being implemented) which allow the various groups to share expertise and experiences for their mutual benefit.
- The partnership has implemented a tutoring program in the public schools for preservice teachers to gain experience with students, especially those considered "at-risk," and a teacher-replacement program to give preservice teachers classroom experience while providing release time for collaborative activities among practicing teachers.
- The partnership held several "Learn the Basics" seminars focusing on technology and have purchased calculators and computer programs to be used by preservice teachers in their undergraduate mathematics classes.
- Meetings are being held and modifications are being made to university classes for preservice teachers based on the input of practicing teachers.
- An advising handbook for students planning to enter Truman State's MAE program was developed to assist both students and advisors across campus with academic planning.
- Plans are being made for preservice teachers to attend professional conferences to interact with practicing teachers.

Each of these activities brings the partnership closer to the vision of providing a seamless transition from the university to the classroom for teachers. The partnership expects graduates entering the classroom to be familiar with the current initiatives and trends in education as well as mathematics and able to make significant contributions to their districts immediately.

### **Mathematics Project Partners**

Kirksville R-III School District - Fiscal Agent

LaPlata R-II School District

Truman State University

Northeast Regional Professional Development Center

**1997 Grant Cycle Approved Amount: \$16,000**

## **SCIENCE PROJECT**

### **Goals 2000 – Science Overview**

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act is designed to support the process of reforming the way teachers are prepared. The preservice teacher training grant at SMSU will provide a systemic model for changing the way universities prepare teachers to teach science from the 1<sup>st</sup> through the 12<sup>th</sup> grades. There will be a fundamental emphasis throughout the program on early and continuous interactions with the 1-12 learning environment. The final curriculum will result from cooperative planning between higher education faculty, both professional educators and content specialists, and practicing 1-12 teachers who have established themselves as being outstanding teachers. The curriculum will integrate disciplinary content and process with educational methodology and pedagogy. This integrated experience will support optimal learning experiences and assist in the molding of reflective decision makers who will, in turn, be capable of providing the best possible experience in science to their 1-12 students in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

Three action teams have been established. They include an elementary/middle team, a secondary (unified science) team, and an assessment team. The first two teams will establish the program objectives, curriculum competencies, and course work sequence required for their particular grade levels. Some of the many factors to be built into the program include:

- formation of cohort groups for sharing experiences, activities, and courses;
- early and continuous interactions with 1-12 learning environments;
- laboratory experiences in preparation, safety, and student research;
- utilization of technology, when appropriate, in their teaching;
- integrate the use of hand-held computers into the learning experience;
- techniques and utilization of distance learning;

- connection of theory and practice through seminars with practicing teachers;
- use of Show-Me Standards, Missouri Frameworks, and National Standards in curricula;
- modeling effective teaching techniques and strategies;
- establishing year-long internships with partner schools, and
- emphasizing the professionalism of teaching.

The third team will establish baseline levels of competence and motivation, and then measure changes in competence and motivation as the newly designed programs are taught on a pilot basis. For the pilot phase, relatively small cohorts of volunteer students will be taken through the new programs.

The pilot program will be in place by the fall of 1998. A fall 1998 cohort group of incoming freshmen will be selected from a group of volunteers who want to participate in this program, with a guarantee that it will

more than satisfy their certification requirements to teach. This first group will continue to progress through the pilot during the 1999-2000 academic year, and a new freshman cohort will start through the first year of the pilot. Once one group has been entirely through the pilot, it will be formalized into an ongoing program.

### **Science Project Partners**

Lebanon R-III School District  
Nixa R-II School District  
Strafford R-VI School District - Fiscal Agent  
Marshfield R-I School District  
Fair Grove R-X School District  
Southwest Missouri State University  
Rolla Regional Professional Development Center  
Southwest Regional Professional Development Center  
Springfield Discovery Center  
High Plains Consortium  
RCET - Southwest

**1997 Grant Cycle Approved Amount: \$39,408**

## **SOCIAL STUDIES PROJECT**

### **“LEARNING TO INTEGRATE SOCIAL STUDIES ACROSS THE CURRICULUM”**

The St. Louis Regional Professional Development Center is the sponsor of this project. Five St. Louis-area teacher education institutions and their partner schools/districts from the St. Louis Professional

Development School Collaborative are participating in this effort.

The goal of this project is to develop and implement plans to improve the education of preservice teachers in the social studies from kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade.

These partnerships are working in the context of their Professional Development Schools (PDS) relationships to inculcate the following exemplary practices into their programs:

- inquiry as the central process of teaching and learning
- field experience/mentoring throughout the teacher education experience
- integration of content knowledge across the disciplines
- multiple approaches to evaluate both student and preservice teacher learning, including performance-based assessment
- the use of technology to plan and implement learning experiences
- integration of community resources into instructional practices and curriculum planning

Outcomes:

- To enable and empower teachers from the beginning of their preservice education to help students achieve the level of excellence required by the Show-Me Standards.
- To develop recommendations for improving the education of preservice teachers to be presented to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education in a monograph documenting the lessons learned from the project.

The initial meeting of the project was held October 16 in conjunction with the PDS Fall Conference. At that time, each partnership reported on its progress to date.

Project staff includes the co-directors Dr. Sharon Lee, Webster University, and Dr. Arthur Shaffer, University of Missouri-St. Louis; the project manager is Sheila Onuska, Cooperating School Districts, Staff Development Division.

**Social Studies Project Partners**

Brentwood School District  
St. Louis City School District  
Parkway C-2 School District  
Kirkwood R-VII School District  
Pattonville R-III School District - Fiscal Agent  
Fontbonne College  
St. Louis University  
University of Missouri-St. Louis  
Washington University  
Webster University  
St. Louis Regional Professional Development Center  
Staff Development Division  
Cooperative School Districts  
Professional Development Schools Collaboration

**1997 Grant Cycle Approved Amount: \$16,333**

## **SCHOOL LEADERSHIP/ADMINISTRATION**

### **Preparing for Tomorrow's School Leaders: A Collaborative Process**

The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri began the redesign of the principal preparation program in 1995. When the Goals 2000 resources became a possibility, the redesign of the program was nearing completion. However, it became evident that specific resources such as those provided by the Goals 2000 project could enrich the experience for the cohort of students, engage school practitioners in development activities, and enable the program to be shared with other leader preparation programs across the state and nation. Essentially, the Goals 2000 resources provided a "value-added" aspect to the new leader preparation program. The grant resources primarily focus on enhancing the use of technology, the development of instructional processes to other preparation programs, and the engagement and dissemination of knowledge and materials to practicing school leaders.

To date, the grant has provided the opportunity for: (a) each graduate student to use technology in a meaningful manner, (b) the development of instructional materials and processes, and (c) the establishment of a process of dissemination and evaluation of the grant and the leader preparation program. Laptop computers have been loaned to each student for the duration of the program (two years). Students are learning how to design educational databases as a means of organizing

traditional "facts and figures" and how to organize and access resources. The students communicate with each other, with faculty and soon with their mentors through the new technology. To date, the goals and progress of the program have been published in one national newsletter and disseminated at state and national professional meetings. Each institution of higher education in the state is being invited to attend any class session and is given access to all instructional materials in the program. The partner district, as well as other districts across the state, will become more involved in the program as it unfolds. The partnership is essentially three months into the implementation grant, and the students have positively evaluated the nature of the program and the instructional materials and processes made possible via the grant. A formal evaluation design is being implemented to effectively evaluate the goals of the grant and the program. The partnership believes this will become an exemplary program, serving as a viable model for leader preparation across the state and nation.

#### **School Leadership/Administration Partners**

Independence 30 School District - Fiscal Agent  
University of Missouri-Columbia  
MU Regional Professional Development Center

**1997 Grant Cycle Approved Amount: \$26,680**

## **APPLIED ARTS/VOCATIONAL TRAINING**

As of October 1, 1997, the team has hired a director, set up and organized an office, instituted accounting procedures, formed a statewide advisory board and conducted a statewide planning conference, reassessed and redefined our governance structure, formed a task force group to define terms and problems, identified instruments and methodologies to assess needs, brainstormed program ideas to address the problems, and begun to write the preliminary sections of the grant for the implementation phase.

The team is currently implementing their redefined planning and governance structure. When this is complete, research into needs will be conducted and those results will guide the creation of programs to address those needs. The statewide conference generated many ideas from which to draw programs to address specific needs. The team expects to have its

program designed and implementation grant submitted by December 1, 1997.

### **Applied Arts/Vocational Training Partners**

St. Joseph School District - Fiscal Agent  
Maryville R-II School District  
Grundy County R-IV School District  
Northwest Missouri State University  
Missouri Western State College  
North Central Community College  
William Woods College  
Northwest Regional Professional Development Center  
Northwest Technical School  
N.S. Hillyard Technical School

**1997 Grant Cycle Approved Amount: \$23,357**

## **CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION AND ASSESSMENT PROJECT GOALS 2000: PRESERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

The Kansas City PDS Collaborative is comprised of the six colleges and universities in the region, seven school districts, and selected business and community organizations. Formed to bring about improvements in the ways individuals are recruited, prepared, and professionally supported, the Collaborative is focused on learning more about the integration of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The Collaborative places a

special emphasis on bringing to the teaching profession individuals from under-represented populations.

Work underway includes the formation of partnerships between colleges and schools. Within these partnerships, planning will take place to ensure long-term relationships in which preservice preparation programs can grow with the direct involvement of college and Pre K-12 faculty. The Collaborative is providing

assistance to schools in the development of career exploration and student cadet programs in middle schools and high schools. A major piece of the partnerships that are forming will be cooperative research projects, school-based college courses, and other initiatives designed to bring colleges and schools closer together.

### **Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Project**

#### **Partners**

Hickman Mills C-I School District - Fiscal Agent  
Excelsior Springs 40 School District  
Grandview C-4 School District  
Independence 30 School District  
Lee's Summit R-VII School District  
Liberty 53 School District  
Kansas City Diocese

University of Missouri-Kansas City  
Avila College  
Park College  
Rockhurst College  
William Jewell College  
Longview Community College  
Kansas City Regional Professional Development Center  
Hoechst Marion Roussel  
Silicon Prairie Technology Assn.  
Lions Club  
Hickman Mills PTA  
West Central Curriculum Directors' Administrators Consortium

**1997 Grant Cycle Approved Amount: \$26,530**

## LEA Improvement

Goals 2000 supports districts' efforts to develop comprehensive school improvement plans. A locally developed Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) is a "plan" which focuses on the improvement of the district's student achievement/performance levels, programs, and services. A CSIP is created by a district to serve as a district "road map" to the long-range improvement the district hopes to realize over a five-year period.

Comprehensive planning, like strategic planning, involves creating a vision of what a district hopes to achieve over a five-year period and identifying a set of strategies and specific action steps to bring about this vision. Districts engage in long-range planning for the following reasons:

- To shape or create the future rather than to allow the future to simply happen. It is a proactive rather than a reactive process.
- To focus on improvement related to student achievement/student performance (MSIP Performance Standards), long-range facility and financial needs, and complex educational program adjustments.
- To tie together a series of short-range (yearly) goals and activities in order to achieve complex or larger goals.
- To break complex improvements into manageable steps.
- To analyze a complex goal and identify the essential, related components which are necessary to achieve

the large goal and which must be implemented in order for the larger, more complex goal to be realized.

- To focus the efforts of the people involved (teachers, parents, community, etc.) on a vision of the future, thereby encouraging a team effort to solving concerns.
- To schedule ancillary support and resources necessary to implement long-range organizational or system change, such as professional development, Career Ladder programs, or restructuring activities.

A district also uses its CSIP to facilitate the integration of federal funds for improving academic achievement for all students.

Since 1995 students in Missouri have been improving their Missouri Mastery & Achievement Test (MMAT) scores. The following chart illustrates how Missouri students have been moving out of the lowest two quintiles (represented by a - sign in the Gain/Loss column) and into the two highest quintiles (represented by a + sign in the Gain/Loss column). The data is represented in percentages of all Missouri students on the following chart.

## MMAT Score Distribution 1995-97

		Reading				Mathematics				Science				Social Studies			
		1995	1996	1997	G/L	1995	1996	1997	G/L	1995	1996	1997	G/L	1995	1996	1997	G/L
Gr.	High	31	33	33	+2	38	39	41	+3								
2		18	18	18	0	17	18	17	0								
		16	16	16	0	13	13	13	0								
		15	15	15	0	13	13	12	-1								
	Low	19	18	18	-1	19	18	17	-2								
Gr.	High	34	34	37	+3	45	46	51	+6	58	59	66	+8	46	47	54	+8
3		22	21	23	+1	20	20	21	+1	18	17	17	-1	18	17	18	0
		17	17	18	+1	14	13	13	-1	9	9	8	-1	12	12	11	-1
		14	14	13	-1	10	10	9	-1	7	7	5	-2	10	10	8	-2
	Low	14	14	10	-4	10	11	7	-3	8	8	4	-4	13	14	9	-4
Gr.	High	31	32	31	0	33	36	35	+2	47	50	51	+4	51	53	54	+3
4		22	22	22	0	22	22	22	0	18	19	18	0	18	18	18	0
		19	19	19	0	17	16	16	-1	14	13	13	-1	13	12	12	-1
		15	15	15	0	14	13	13	-1	10	10	9	-1	11	10	9	-2
	Low	13	12	12	-1	14	13	13	-1	10	9	9	-1	8	7	7	-1
Gr.	High	33	33	35	+2	37	38	41	+4	55	57	62	+7	37	37	41	+4
5		21	21	21	0	20	12	21	+1	18	17	17	-1	21	20	21	0
		16	16	16	0	17	16	15	-2	11	11	10	-1	15	16	15	0
		14	13	14	0	13	13	12	-1	8	8	6	-2	14	14	13	-1
	Low	17	17	14	-3	13	13	11	-2	8	8	5	-3	13	13	10	-2
Gr.	High	28	27	29	+1	54	55	59	+5	53	55	59	+6	41	41	44	+3
6		20	21	22	+2	19	18	18	-1	16	15	15	-1	19	19	20	+1
		19	19	19	0	11	11	10	-1	11	11	10	-1	13	13	13	0
		17	17	17	0	8	8	7	-1	9	8	8	-1	13	13	12	-1
	Low	16	16	14	-2	8	8	6	-2	11	11	8	-3	14	14	11	-3
Gr.	High	26	27	28	+2	40	41	44	+4	45	48	52	+7	29	30	31	+2
7		21	21	22	+1	21	21	22	+1	19	18	18	-1	21	21	21	0
		17	17	17	0	15	14	14	-1	13	12	12	-1	17	16	17	0
		16	16	16	0	12	12	10	-2	12	11	10	-2	16	15	15	-1
	Low	20	20	17	-3	14	12	10	-4	11	11	8	-3	18	18	16	-2

		Reading				Mathematics				Science				Social Studies			
		1995	1996	1997	G/L	1995	1996	1997	G/L	1995	1996	1997	G/L	1995	1996	1997	G/L
Gr.	High	30	30	35	+5	46	49	48	+2	47	47	55	+8	34	33	39	+5
8		21	20	21	0	19	18	19	0	17	16	15	-2	20	19	19	-1
		18	17	17	+1	13	13	13	0	13	12	11	-2	15	15	16	+1
		16	18	14	-2	10	11	11	+1	11	11	8	-3	14	15	12	-2
	Low	15	15	13	-2	12	10	10	-2	13	14	11	-2	18	18	15	-3
Gr.	High	20	20	21	+1	29	30	33	+4	54	56	58	+4	28	28	29	+1
9		17	17	18	+1	19	20	19	0	20	19	19	-1	21	21	22	+1
		17	17	17	0	16	16	15	-1	13	12	11	-2	17	17	17	0
		19	19	19	0	16	15	14	-2	9	8	7	-2	18	16	16	0
	Low	27	26	26	-1	20	19	18	-2	5	5	4	-1	18	17	16	-2
Gr.	High	26	28	30	+4	36	41	40	+4	35	40	43	+8	21	23	24	+3
10		17	18	19	+2	19	19	20	+1	19	18	19	0	19	19	20	+1
		16	15	16	0	15	14	15	0	14	14	14	0	17	17	19	+2
		17	17	17	0	13	12	12	-1	12	12	11	-1	18	18	17	-1
	Low	24	23	18	-6	18	15	14	-4	19	16	13	-6	25	24	20	-5

*For more information, contact:*

**Assistant Director, Goals 2000**

**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**

**P.O. Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480**

**Telephone: 573-526-3232 Fax: 573-751-9434**

**E-mail: [fedpro@mail.dese.state.mo.us](mailto:fedpro@mail.dese.state.mo.us)**

*This report can be viewed on the World Wide Web at:*

**<http://services.dese.state.mo.us/divinstr/fedprog/showme.htm>**